

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00094 01 OF 02 021118Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02  
SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /089 W  
-----087394 021119Z /11

R 021049Z MAR 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2659  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0094

E O 11652: GDS  
TAGS010/76., NATO, MBFR  
SUBJ: MBFR: SUMMARY OF INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF FEBRUARY 28, 1978

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE FEBRUARY 28, 1978 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE BELGIAN, FRG AND US REPS, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV AND SHUSTOV, CZECHOSLOVAK REP KEBLUSEK AND GDR REP OESER.

2. EACH SIDE MADE ONE GENERAL STATEMENT. THE MAIN FOCUS OF DISCUSSION WAS AGAIN ON STATEMENTS TO BE MADE PRIOR TO EXCHANGE OF DATA, IN PARTICULAR, ON SENTENCE 1 OF SECTION 2. WESTERN REPS EXPRESSED THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MOVES WHICH THE WEST HAD MADE SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE ROUND TO MEET INTERESTS EXPRESSED BY THE EAST, AND ASKED WHETHER THERE WAS ANY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE COMMITMENTS ENTAILED IN AGREEING TO SECTION 3 OF THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS AND THE COMMITMENTS ENTAILED BY AGREEMENT TO THE FIRST SENTENCE OF SECTION 2 OF THE VERSION SUGGESTED BY THE EAST. THEY EXPLAINED WHY THE WEST'S  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00094 01 OF 02 021118Z

FEBRUARY 21 PROPOSAL FOR ALTERNATE LANGUAGE OF SENTENCE 1 OF SECTION 2 MET THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES. IF THE EAST DID NOT AGREE, IT SHOULD PRODUCE ALTERNATE LANGUAGE OF ITS OWN FOR THIS SENTENCE. TARASOV MADE A LONG STATEMENT INTENDED TO REFUTE WESTERN CLAIMS OF MOVEMENT. HE INSISTED ON WESTERN ACCEPTANCE OF SENTENCE 1 OF SECTION 2, BUT SAID THIS CONTAINED NO COMMITMENTS BEYOND THOSE IN SECTION 3. WESTERN REPS SAID, IN THAT EVENT, SENTENCE 1 OF SECTION 2 WAS

SUPERFLUOUS.

3. BELGIAN REP LED OFF WITH STATEMENT OF THE WESTERN POSITION THAT EASTERN ADVANTAGES IN GEOGRAPHY MUST BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN ESTABLISHING THE TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS.

4. CZECHOSLOVAK REP COMPARED THE REDUCTION APPROACHES OF EAST AND WEST, ARGUING THAT THE WESTERN APPROACH WOULD RESULT IN A SITUATION WHERE THE EAST WOULD HAVE ONLY 565,000 GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL AS COMPARED TO THE WEST'S 700,000, WITH RESULTANT DAMAGE TO EASTERN SECURITY. THE EASTERN REDUCTIONS APPROACH, ON THE OTHER HAND, WOULD BE EQUITABLE, PRESERVING THE PRESENT APPROXIMATE PARITY BETWEEN THE FORCES OF THE TWO SIDES. CZECHOSLOVAK REP CONCLUDED HIS REMARKS WITH STRONG CRITICISM OF FAILURE OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS OTHER THAN THE US TO UNDERTAKE COMMITMENTS ON THE TIMING AND SCOPE OF THEIR PHASE II REDUCTIONS.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00094 02 OF 02 021127Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-10 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 SP-02  
SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /089 W  
-----087466 021130Z /20

R 021049Z MAR 78  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2660  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0094

5. US REP DESCRIBED THE MAY IN WHICH THE WEST HAD MOVED SINCE THE OUTSET OF THE PRESENT ROUND TO MEET EASTERN INTEREST IN AN AGREED STATEMENT TO PRECLUDE DATA EXCHANGE. HE POINTED OUT THAT SECTION 3 CONTAINED AN ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA TO BE EXCHANGED, AND IN SECTION 4 WESTERN REPS WOULD AGREE TO THIS DESCRIPTION. US REP ASKED WHETHER THERE WAS ANY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE COMMITMENTS WHICH THE WEST WOULD BE ASSUMING IN

AGREEING TO SECTION 3 AND THE COMMITMENTS WHICH THE WEST WOULD BE ASSUMING IF IT AGREED TO THE FIRST SENTENCE OF SECTION 2 IN THE WORDING PROPOSED BY THE EAST. OESER SAID THE WESTERN REPLY ON NOVEMBER 9TH TO THE EAST'S OCTOBER 25 PROPOSAL HAD BEEN AN UNCLEAR ONE, CREATING A NEED FOR EXCHANGE OF ORAL STATEMENTS WHICH WOULD DEFINE THE BASIS OF THE FUTURE DATA EXCHANGE. THE STEPS TAKEN BY THE WEST SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT ROUND ALSO GAVE REASON TO DOUBT THAT THE WEST WAS PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE EAST'S OCTOBER 25 PROPOSAL. THE REASONS GIVEN BY THE WEST FOR ITS REFUSAL TO ACCEPT SENTENCE 1 OF SECTION 2

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00094 02 OF 02 021127Z

WERE INADEQUATE. THE WEST SHOULD CLEARLY INDICATE ITS ACCEPTANCE.

6. TARASOV IN A LENGTHY PRESENTATION COMMENTED ON EACH OF US REP'S POINTS. THE ORAL STATEMENTS WERE A NECESSARY PREREQUISITE FOR DATA EXCHANGE. IT WAS NECESSARY TO HAVE A STATEMENT WHICH DESCRIBED THE DATA TO BE EXCHANGED AND EXPRESSED THE AGREEMENT OF PARTICIPANTS TO EXCHANGE THESE DATA. THE OCTOBER 25 PROPOSAL WAS THE CULMINATING ITEM IN A SERIES OF PRIOR PROPOSALS FOR DATA EXCHANGE. THUS, THERE WAS NO NEED TO SPECIFY ALL PRIOR PROPOSALS. THE EAST'S OCTOBER 25 PROPOSAL WAS A NATURAL POINT OF DEPARTURE FOR THE FUTURE DATA EXCHANGE. IT SHOULD THEREFORE BE MENTIONED IN SECTION 1. THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF FEBRUARY 21 FOR A NEW FIRST SENTENCE FOR SECTION 2 WAS A STEP BACKWARD. THE WESTERN STATEMENT IN SECTION 4 WAS AN INADEQUATE STATEMENT OF WESTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE EAST'S OCTOBER 25 PROPOSAL WHICH COULD LEAD TO MISUNDERSTANDING. THE ADEQUATE AND RIGHT STATEMENT OF WESTERN ACCEPTANCE WAS IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF SECTION 2. TARASOV REPLIED TO US REP'S QUESTION THAT THE EAST SAW NO DIFFERENCE IN THE SCOPE OF COMMITMENTS IN SECTION 3 AND IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF SECTION 2, BUT ARGUED THAT SECTIONS 3 AND 4 TAKEN TOGETHER DID NOT CONTAIN THE NECESSARY ACCEPTANCE OF THE EAST'S OCTOBER 25 PROPOSAL WHICH WAS SET FORTH IN THE FIRST SENTENCE OF SECTION 2.

7. US REP TOOK NOTE OF TARASOV'S REMARKS THAT THE PROJECTED STATEMENTS WERE CONFINED TO DESCRIPTION OF DATA TO BE EXCHANGED AND THAT THERE WAS NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE COMMITMENTS IN SECTION 3 AND SECTION 2. THIS INDICATED TO HIM THAT SENTENCE 1 OF SECTION 2 WAS SUPERFLUOUS, WHEREAS THE WESTERN AGREEMENT IN SECTION 4 WITH THE DATA TO BE EXCHANGED DESCRIBED IN SECTION 3 WAS IN THE APPROPRIATE PLACE IN A LESS AMBIGUOUS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00094 02 OF 02 021127Z

FORM.

8. FRG REP SUMMARIZED THE PRESENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE DISCUSSION OF THE DATA EXCHANGE OVER THE PAST YEAR. HE EXPLAINED WHY THE WEST'S PROPOSAL OF FEBRUARY 21 OF ALTERNATE LANGUAGE FOR THE FIRST SENTENCE OF SECTION 2 SHOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO BOTH EAST AND WEST, AND MET THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES. IF THE EAST DID NOT AGREE, THEN IT SHOULD PROPOSE AN ALTERNATE FIRST SENTENCE OF SECTION 2.

9. TARASOV CLAIMED FRG REP HAD MERELY REPEATED THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF FEBRUARY 21. IN DISCUSSION OF THE TIMING OF THE NEXT INFORMAL SESSION, TARASOV AGREED TO HOLD A FURTHER INFORMAL SESSION ON MARCH 2, BUT INDICATED THAT, SINCE THE WEST HAD NOT CHANGED ITS POSITION ON THE STATEMENTS AND HAD NOTHING NEW TO ADD TO PREVIOUS STATEMENTS, THE EAST WOULD COME TO THE MARCH 2 SESSION PREPARED TO ADDRESS GENERAL SUBJECTS. TARASOV AGREED THAT IF THE WEST WISHED TO ADDRESS THE WORDING OF THE TEXT OF STATEMENTS PRIOR TO DATA EXCHANGE, IT WAS FREE TO DO SO, BUT REPEATED THAT THE EAST WOULD ADDRESS GENERAL SUBJECTS. END SUMMARY.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 jan 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** DISARMAMENT, MEETINGS, MEETING REPORTS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 02 mar 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 01 jan 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978MBFRV00094  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780095-0724  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t197803115/aaaadtni.tel  
**Line Count:** 193  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** bedb3dba-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 12 may 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 3142240  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: SUMMARY OF INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRE- RESENTATIVES OF FEBRUARY 28, 1978  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/bedb3dba-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014